

Subj: **Sikh and Punjabi Studies Chair at UCR**  
Date: 8/30/2008 1:09:27 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time  
From: [BALDEVSINGH07@comcast.net](mailto:BALDEVSINGH07@comcast.net)  
To: [stephen.cullenberg@ucr.edu](mailto:stephen.cullenberg@ucr.edu), [ellen.wartella@ucr.edu](mailto:ellen.wartella@ucr.edu)  
CC: [falcon525@aol.com](mailto:falcon525@aol.com), [jasbirmann@aol.com](mailto:jasbirmann@aol.com), [wellington264@yahoo.com](mailto:wellington264@yahoo.com), [gb7495@hotmail.com](mailto:gb7495@hotmail.com),  
[editor@sikhspectrum.com](mailto:editor@sikhspectrum.com)

Dear Dr. Cullenberg,

The letter with an attachment I sent this morning has a typo, the year Professor Pashaura Singh was hired by UCR is typed 1995 instead of 2005. Sorry for the mistake. Corrected letter with an attachment is sent again.

Baldev Singh

Dear Dean Cullenberg,

Before commenting on your letter to Dr. Sahi, please allow me to introduce myself: Ph.D. degree in Medicinal Chemistry from the State University of New York at Buffalo (1967), research in Drug Discovery in pharmaceutical industry (32 years), authored and co-authored about sixty publications, and inventor and co-inventor of 100 U.S. patents.

I have been a dedicated student of Sikhism and Sikh history since my college days in the 1950s. And I have studied old and new works on Sikhism by Sikh as well non-Sikh scholars and published critical reviews of some of them (Appendix). I wholeheartedly support research on the Sikh Scripture (Aad Guru Granth Sahib) and other "Sikh scriptures".

Now let me share with you my main concern about the controversial selection of Dr. Pashaura Singh for the Sikh and Punjabi Studies Chair at the University of California at Riverside (UCR). I think UCR has overlooked Dr. Singh's background during the selection process. For example:

1. After receiving Ph.D. from the University of Toronto in 1992, Dr. Singh joined the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor as Visiting Assistant Professor. However, after few years he was demoted to the rank of a Senior Lecturer and, he remained there in that position until UCR hired him in 2005 at the rank of Full Professor of Religious Studies. Considering both the University of Michigan (UM) and UCR as our top notch academic institutions, I would like to ask: How can a candidate demoted from Assistant Professor to a Senior Lecturer at UM be hired as Full Professor

in the same field at UCR?

2. Dr. Singh and his supervisor W. H. McLeod ghostwrote an article under the name of C. H. Loehlin to justify historical and textual studies of Adi Granth and ghostwrote *Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy* under the name of Piar Singh in order to defend their scholarship thereby undermining the credibility Of Daljeet Singh, Jasbir Singh Mann, and the Institute of Sikh Studies (attachment) *Pages 5-12*
3. You have stated that "recent review of Professor Singh's scholarship, carried out through the University of California's academic personnel process, supported the view that Professor Singh's research was of high quality."

Do the experts who reviewed Professor Singh's scholarship have **expertise on Aad Guru Granth Sahib (AGGS) as Professor Singh's controversial research is about AGGS?**

4. In response to the query about Professor Singh's research you say that he stands by his research. To my knowledge Professor Singh has not responded as yet to the criticism of his research in an academic manner either at a seminar or publication. I grant that the criticisms of his Ph.D. thesis constituted both fair and unfair assessments. However, the thesis was challenged and criticized by many scholars (***Planned Attack on Aad Sri Guru Granth Sahib: Academics or Blasphemy***, 1994). Professor Singh could have settled the issue once and for all by responding in a professional manner. Instead, he opted to get his research work sanctified by the Sikh clergy at Amritsar. His appearance before the clergy was arranged by him: "This was agreed upon in a conference call with the Acting-Jathedar on November 11, 1993. Jasbeer Singh of Mobil Systems, Inc. (p. o. Box 3629, Wise, VA 24293-3629, USA) arranged this call with Bhai Manjit Singh who was at Takhat Sri Kesgarh Sahib, Punjab, at that time." (Pashaura Singh, "Recent trends and prospects in Sikh studies", *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 1998, 27 (4), pp 407-25).

**If Professor Singh stands by his work then there is no reason why he should not present his defense at a seminar to an audience of experts on Sikh studies including his critics. Until and unless these issues are resolved in a professional and scholarly manner, Professor Singh's research on Sikhism and the role of UCR will remain under a cloud of suspicion not only among the Sikhs but also among many objective scholars of Sikh studies.**

Sincerely,

Baldev Singh

2025 Tres Picos Drive  
Yuba City, CA 95993.

Tel. phone: 530-870-8040.

## Appendix

1. Baldev Singh, "Sikh Studies and Ghostwriting: Who Wrote "The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism" and "*Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy*", SikhSpectrum.com, July 2008.
2. Baldev Singh, "Endowed Chairs in Sikhism at Western Universities", SikhSpectrum.com, August 2007.
3. Baldev Singh, "What Type of Sikhism is Represented at Western Universities", *Understanding Sikhism Res. J.*, 2007, **9**(1), pp. 19-21.
4. Baldev Singh, "Understanding W. H. McLeod and His Work on Sikhism", SikhSpectrum.com, August 2005.
5. Baldev Singh, "My Favourite Author", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2007.
6. Baldev Singh, "Unacademic, Unethical and Unsolicited Advice", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2007
7. Baldev Singh, "W. H. McLeod's Interpretation of Guru Nanak's Bani", February 2006.
8. Baldev Singh, "Sant Tradition or Sant Mat" SikhSpectrum.com, November 2007.
9. Baldev Singh, "Critical Reading of Harjot Oberoi's *The Construction of religious Boundaries: Culture, Identity and Diversity in the Sikh Tradition*", SikhSpectrum .com, August 2007.
10. Baldev Singh, "Relocating Gender in Sikh History: Transformation, Meaning and Identity (Author: Doris Jakobsh): A Critical Analysis", SikhSpectrum. Com, November 2006.
11. Baldev Singh, "*Bachittar Natak: A Strange Drama*", SikhSpectrum.com, February 2005.
12. Baldev Singh, "Evaluating Dyanand's Views on Guru Nanak and the Sikhs" in "e-Symposium: Swami Dyanand and *Satyarth Parkash (Light of Truth)*", SikhSpectrum.com, March 2008.
13. Baldev Singh, "Khushwant Singh and His Continuous Distortion of Sikhism", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2007.
14. Baldev Singh, "A Critical Appraisal of Bhai Harbans Lal's writings on Sikhism", SikhSpectrum.com, February 2007.
15. Baldev Singh, "A Critical Review of *Sachi Sakhi and Parasarprasma*", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2005.
16. Baldev Singh, "Some of Bhai Randhir Singh's Writings", SikhSpectrum.com, November 2004.
17. Baldev Singh, "Five Khands (Realms) of Japji",

SikhSpectrum.com, May 2006.

18. Baldev Singh, "Ardas: Sikh Congregational Prayer", SikhSpectrum.com, November 2005.
19. Baldev Singh, "Responding to Reverend Zekveld's A Comparison Between Two Credos: Christian and Sikh", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2006.
20. Baldev Singh, "Dr. Zidani's Interpretation of Guru Nanak's Thoughts: A Rejoinder", SikhSpectrum.com, November 2004.
21. Baldev Singh, "Was Guru Nanak a Hindu or Muslim?" SikhSpectrum.com, November 2007.
22. Baldev Singh, "Legacy of Rishis and Munis", SikhSpectrum.Com, February 2006.
23. Baldev Singh, "What is the Meaning of 'Hindu'", SikhSpectrum.com, July 2008.
24. Baldev Singh, "Dear Oprah: Reverend Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi", SikhSpectrum.com, August 2003.
25. Baldev Singh, "Review of *Gandhi: Behind the Mask of Divinity*" SikhSpectrum.com, August 2004.
26. Baldev Singh, "Review of *Gandhi: Under Cross Examination*", SikhSpectrum.com, July 2008.
27. Baldev Sing, "Mutiny of 1857: The Search for Truth", SikhSpectrum.com, August 2007.
28. Baldev Singh, "**Primer on Nanakian Philosophy**", scheduled for SikhSpectrum.com, October 2008.

## Sikh Studies and Ghostwriters

### Who wrote “The Need FOR TEXTUAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM” and “Gatha Sri Adi Granth And The Controversy”?

- Baldev Singh

#### Introduction

Plagiarism is quite common in academia, especially in the disciplines of humanities whereas ghostwriting is generally the domain of propagandists; however, there is a reference to ghostwriting even in the nascent field of Sikh studies in Western universities reported in *Planned Attack on Aad Sri Guru Granth Sahib: Academics or Blasphemy* [1-i,] published in 2004. In 1992, in a letter addressed to W.H. McLeod, Joseph T. O’Connell and Pashaura Singh, Jasbir Singh Mann asked the following questions [1-ii].

1. When and how you came across GNDU Manuscript 1245 and where it was before 1987?
2. Who could publish article under the authorship of Dr. Loehlin in 1987 & 1990 suggesting, “Western friends of Sikhism and the Sikhs likewise have noted this lack of critical interest on part of the Sikhs. Fortunately, many of their scholars and research experts are doing research on textual and historical problem?”

Mann has boldly questioned the integrity of the three, but none of them has responded to his questions as yet. However, Pashaura Singh does quote Dr. Loehlin to justify the need for textual and historical criticism of Aad (Adi) Granth: “The Sikhs will hold a unique position among the religions of the world if they prove through careful textual criticism the widely accepted belief that the Kartarpur Granth is the MS dictated by Guru Arjan [2].” And, he cites the following reference for the above statement.

C. Loehlin, “The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism”, *The Sikh Courier* (Spring-Summer, 1987), p. 18. Originally, this paper was read at the Punjab History Conference and published in its proceedings, 1966. Archer’s comments may be seen in “The Bible of Sikhs”, *The Review of Religion* (January 1949), pp. 115-25).

While Pashaura Singh’s reference to Loehlin’s original paper is skimpy, his supervisor, W. H. McLeod provides much more information in his reference [3] to three authors who examined the *Kartarpuri Bir*.

Dr. Jodh Singh's observations are set out in detail in his *Kartarpuri Bir de Darshan* and briefly in an English article entitled 'A Note on Kartarpur Granth' published in the *Proceedings of Punjab History Conference*, First Session (Patiala: Punjabi University, 1966 for 1965), pp. 97-99. Professor Archer recorded his experience in an article entitled 'The Bible of Sikhs', published in *The Review of Religion*, January 1949, pp. 115-25. Dr. Loehlin's account is to be found in his *The Sikhs and their Book* (Lucknow, 1946), pp. 44-5, and more recently in an article "A Westerner looks at the Kartarpur Granth" published in *Proceedings of Punjab History Conference*, 1966, First Session, pp. 93-6.

## Discussion

### The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism

The examination of C. Loehlin's 1987 article "The Need for Textual And Historical Criticism" [4] by Gurnam Kaur and Kharak Singh [1-iii] found out that the first part (roughly a page and one third) of this article is the same word-for-word as the paper "Textual Criticism Of The Kartarpur Granth" that C. H. Loehlin read at the Sikh Studies Conference at Berkley in 1976, which was published later in 1979 [5]. Thus, C. Loehlin is the same person as C. H. Loehlin. But, it is astonishing that the article cited by Pashaura Singh makes no mention of Loehlin's 1979 paper. Furthermore, a long note by Jodh Singh about his examination of Kartarpur Granth (*Kartarpuri Bir*) in Loehlin's 1979 paper is completely missing in the 1987 article cited by Pashaura Singh. And, there are other significant differences between these two articles. For example, the statement of Archer in Loehlin's 1979 article that questions the authenticity of Kartarpur Granth is reproduced, while Loehlin's statement affirming its authenticity is omitted.

The problem of the book is acute. This is considered to be the Adi Granth, the "original" or only copy in existence of the "original". But it bears no date, not any scribe's name, nor is its history clear. Its authenticity [authenticity] cannot be proved. It is said that Guru Teg Bahadur hid it once for fourteen days in the River Beas, to protect it ... but there is no sign of water-damage. There are copies here and there, in the Golden Temple, for example [4, 5].

From Dr. Jodh Singh's careful investigation, then, the authenticity of the Kartarpur Granth's claim to be the original manuscript dictated by Guru Arjan is established by the blank pages scattered throughout the Book. The cryptic writing at the beginning turns out to be, probably, the ink formula used, often given in old manuscripts. The authenticity of the disputed *Rag Mala* (List of Tunes) at the end also has been proved [5].

Further, the following paragraph written in third person, in which Archer and Loehlin's remarks are amplified and emphasized as the comments of well meaning friendly critics, is not found in Loehlin's 1979 paper.

The above observations are not so superficial, as they might at first seem. For one thing, Dr. Archer's statements are those of a trained observer. Both are the reaction of friendly critics who know how irreplaceable such a book is. Both are from men who have had to study the involved subject of textual criticism of the Christian Scriptures, in an effort to establish, the original text with no original manuscripts of it extant. The Sikhs will hold a unique position among the religious [religions] of the world if they prove through careful textual criticism the widely accepted belief that the Kartarpur Granth is the MS dictated by Guru Arjan. This should not be

impossible, and there are qualified Sikh scholars to do it. To this end, would it not be possible to obtain photo-static copies of the entire book? This would not only preserve to the world the ancient book but make it available for intensive study as well [4].

In addition, the 1987 article cited by Pashaura Singh contains some extra material which is not present in Loehlin's 1966 paper or its 1979 updated version. The extra material consists of references to Giani Partap Singh suggesting literary criticism of *Dasam Granth* to determine the authorship of its various contents [6] and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's friendly warning to Sikhs in his Introduction to *The Sacred Writings of the Sikhs* [7] about the general decline of living up to the ideals laid down in the Aad Guru Granth Sahib, and the following statement at the end of the article, which is part of Mann's second question.

“Western friends of Sikhism and the Sikhs likewise have noted this lack of critical interest on part of the Sikhs. Fortunately, many of their scholars and research experts are doing research on textual and historical problem [4].”

Besides, there is material from J. S. Grewal and S. S. Bal's *Guru Gobind Singh* [8] that questions Sikh traditional views about the Baisakhi of 1699, and the investing of Guruship in either the Khalsa Panth or Aad Guru Granth Sahib.

If we turn to contemporary and near contemporary evidence enough of the details gets confirmed, but not all. That a considerable number of Sikhs used to visit Anandpur at the time of Baisakhi and that on the Baisakhi of 1699 many of the Sikhs were especially asked to come, that the *Khande ki pahul* was administered to those who were willing to become the Guru's Khalsa (though no exact figures are mentioned anywhere), that a considerable number of people – the *brahmans* and *khatris* in particular rejected the *pahul*, that the Khalsa were required to wear their *keshas* and arms, that they were required not to smoke, that the appellation “singh” came to be adopted by a large number of the Khalsa – all this is there in the earliest evidence. But the dramatic call for the laying down of life for the Guru, his request to the five beloved that they should initiate him into Khalsa by administering *pahul*, the vesting of Guruship in either the Khalsa panth or the Adi Granth – all these very important and interrelated items are not to be found in the available contemporary evidence. In fact, in the near contemporary records left to posterity by the Sikhs themselves, there are frequent references to “five weapons” rather than to five k's; and the Adi granth is not given exclusive preference over the *bani* of Guru Gobind Singh.

As these vital points are sanctified by the belief of a large number of the followers of Guru Gobind Singh from the late eighteenth century down to the present day, it may be argued in fact that that the strength of that belief goes in favour of their authenticity. It is not being suggested that their authenticity is definitely unwarranted. But one cannot help thinking that the authenticity of these vital points is yet to be firmly established, unless of course one refused to think historically and for oneself. Search for more contemporary evidence must be made; the later tradition and historical circumstances under which it came into existence must be thoroughly examined; and, meanwhile, the historian may suspend judgment on these vital points [4].

On the other hand, considerable material from the 1979 article is left out. Moreover, a note in the 1987 article cited by Pashaura leaves the impression as if Loehlin was employed by the University of California at Berkley (DR. C. H. Loehlin, Berkley University, USA) [4]. However, there is no evidence that Loehlin even lived near Berkley not to speak of him being associated

with the University in any manner or capacity in 1987 as he was staying in “Westminister Gardens”, an assisted living facility and an affiliate of Southern California Presbyterian Homes (1420 Santo Domingo Avenue, Duarte, California 91010). It was confirmed by Dr. Jasbir Singh Mann in 1992, when he visited Mr. Rollins, the Executive Director of the facility. He told Mann that since 1983 Dr. Loehlin was incapable of doing any academic work. According to records of the Home he neither wrote nor revised any such paper [1-iv]. Further, Loehlin’s daughter, Mrs. Marian Davies told Mann, “She does not recall that her dad published any article on Sikhism in later years of his life when he moved to Westminister Gardens [1-v].” Moreover, C. H. Loehlin was born on May 14, 1897 in Brooklyn, New York and died on September 27, 1987 at the age of 90 in San Gabriel, California (Presbyterian Historical Society, 425 Lombard Street, Philadelphia, PA 19147).

It is bizarre that the 1987 article cited by Pashaura Singh was published three years later in *The Sikh Review*, March-April, 1990, pp. 55-58? What is even more bizarre is that here the author is Dr. C. Loehlin, not C. Loehlin and there is no mention of him being at Berkeley, nor is there a mention of either his 1966 paper or the 1979 paper. Besides, the first three reference cited in the 1987 article are omitted and there is change in the title from all capital letters to “The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism”. It seems that these changes were made to create the impression that the article was a brand new article written by Dr. C. Loehlin!

Now the question is why C. H. Loehlin, who raised textual issue of Kartarpur Granth (*Kartapuri Bir*) at the Punjab Historical Conference in 1966, would raise the same issue after so many years in 1987 in an obscure non-academic publication, *The Sikh Courier* published in England, without reference to his 1979 paper in which he quotes Jodh Singh’s work that confirms its authenticity? Moreover, why would he publish the same article twice under different initials in different journals three years apart? Besides, the information about Loehlin’s health in 1980s and his death on September 27, 1987 casts serious doubt on the authorship of this article by him. Then who is the ghostwriter who published the same article under Loehlin’s name in 1987 and 1990? May be it was someone who was desperate enough to cast doubts on the authenticity of Kartarpur Granth and inadvertently left his finger prints on the statement: “Western friends of Sikhism and the Sikhs likewise have noted this lack of critical interest on part of the Sikhs. Fortunately, many of their scholars and research experts are doing research on textual and historical problem.” From this statement it is clear that the article was written by someone to justify the textual and historical study of the Adi Granth and to appeal to the Sikhs that it would be done by scholars who are friends of the Sikhs.

To my knowledge nobody, especially non-Sikhs, ever consulted Sikhs for doing research on Sikhism. Why does the author of the above statement want to assure the Sikhs that research on the textual and historical problems will be done by friendly scholars? The “friendly scholars” who were involved in the textual study of the Adi Granth were Piar Singh, Gurinder Singh Mann (J. S. Hawley, supervisor) and Pashaura Singh (W. H. McLeod, supervisor). Who among these scholars was trying to assure the Sikhs of his friendship? Was it someone who had a credibility problem among the Sikhs, and could that person be W. H. McLeod [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]?

### **Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy**



In 2004, I came across references to Piar Singh's *Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy* (1996) [15] in McLeod's *Discovering the Sikhs: Autobiography of a Historian* [16]. The first part of the title *Gatha Sri Adi Granth* is the same as Piar Singh's *Gatha Sri Adi Granth* (Punjabi) [17] published by Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) in October 1992. But due to the controversial nature of the book, GNDU suspended its sale immediately on December 16, 1992. The ban on this book started immediately a passionate debate in the media between Piar Singh and his supporters on one side and others who saw major flaws in Piar Singh's research. This debate lasted until 1995.

*Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy* deals with MS 1245 (GNDU), *Mohan Pothis*, *Mulmantra* and the controversial debate. Its main thrust, however, is the repudiation of Daljeet Singh's *Essays on the Authenticity of Kartarpuri Bir* which exposes McLeod's "**scholarship, methodology and ethics**" [10-i ], and to undermine the integrity of Daljeet Singh, Dr. Jasbir Singh Mann (California) and the Institute of Sikh Studies (Chandigarh). It does not make any sense why this book was published in 1996 in Michigan, USA. Inquiries made about the publisher of this book led to Jaswant Singh who provided this book, besides the banned book of Piar Singh, *Gatha Sri Adi Granth* (Punjabi). I was in for a bigger surprise when I read the last paragraph of the Preface.

I owe my gratitude to a number of friends who have helped me see this book through. Seeking indulgence of others, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to Mr. Robert Moore, the distinguished Language Instructor of Grand Ledge Public Schools, Michigan (U.S.A) who has taken immense pains to go through the draft of the book, make corrections and suggest valuable improvements. My profound thanks are due to Dr. Jaswant Singh who has managed to see the book published through the Anant Education and Rural Development Foundation, Inc, Michigan (U.S.A.). I owe my thanks to him for prevailing upon Dr. Pashaura Singh as well to lend me, for reproduction in this book, the photocopies of the facsimiles of the Kartarpuri Bir, that he possessed [15-i].

Now who is Jaswant Singh and what is his field of expertise? There is no evidence that Singh is involved in Sikh studies or that he promotes Sikh studies or Sikhism. Jaswant Singh did not publish any book on Sikhism before *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy*. Besides, how did Piar Singh know Jaswant Singh? What is the relationship between Pashaura Singh and Jaswant Singh, and who introduced Piar Singh to Robert Moore? To make some sense, I studied *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* and compared some of the statements from this book (15-ii) quoted in *Discovering the Sikhs: Autobiography of a Historian* 61-i). It becomes abundantly clear that someone put words in the mouth of a dead man, Piar Singh (1914-1996), to defend W. H. McLeod and Pashaura Singh and to malign Daljeet Singh (1911-1994), Jasbir Singh Mann, and the Institute of Sikh Studies in Chandigarh. But the main target is Daljeet Singh.

It is highly unlikely that Piar Singh wrote *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* due to the following reasons.

**First**, when Piar Singh was asked, "Why are you bowing to the Sikh clergy to defend your research work?" "Because I am a devout Sikh" was his reply. Pashaura Singh too gives the same justification for his repentance before the Sikh clergy [16-ii, 18]. So why would a devout Sikh

publish another controversial book to defend his *Gatha Sri Adi Granth*, which was banned by the Sikh clergy?

**Second**, comparison of the language of *Gatha Sri Adi Granth* and the language of *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* demonstrates that Piar Singh could not be the author of latter. Piar Singh was a lecturer in Punjabi at the Government College, Ludhiana, and I (1955-57) remember him as a soft-spoken, polite and sweet person. Here is a case in point: Commenting on Daljeet Singh's *Essays on the Authenticity of Kartarpuri Bir and the Integrated Logic of Sikhism*, which he studied in 1987, Piar Singh says, "The learned author has not brought out any new information/fact, he has simply reiterated the rational exposition/interpretation of Bhai Jodh Singh's *Kartarpuri Bir de Darshan*. The author claims that there are many features/attributes of *Kartarpuri Bir* which could not be in copied versions. This is indeed a tall claim [17-i]." Later he does not mention Daljeet Singh's name even once; he simply tries to demolish Bhai Jodh Singh's findings and arguments about the authenticity of *Kartarpuri Bir* one by one without resorting to unprofessional language [17-ii]. However, some of the statements we find in *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth And The controversy* appear as outbursts of a vindictive person against "his enemies".

**Third**, why would Piar Singh ask Robert Moore, the language instructor from Michigan and who had no expertise on the subject matter, to proof read the draft of his book? Wouldn't Piar Singh ask people like Prof. S. S. Dosanjh, Prof. Hracharan Bains, and Prof. Darshan Singh Maini or Gurdarshan Singh Grewal (Advocate General) or Pritam Singh (retired IAS officer), who defended his academic freedom to proof read the draft and write the foreword [15-iii]?

**Fourth**, *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* does not in any manner enhance Piar Singh's integrity or scholarship; instead, it portrays him in poor light. It makes him look like a simple-minded person who did not know what he was talking about. For example:

- A. Piar Singh's conclusion about the *Kartarpuri Bir* is seriously flawed and way of the mark. Both Pashaura Singh (*The Guru Granth Sahib: Canon, Meaning and Authority*) [19] and Gurinder Singh Mann (*The Making of Sikh Scripture*) [20] disagree with Piar Singh, but agree with Bhai Jodh Singh and Daljeet Singh's conclusion supporting the authenticity of '*Kartarpuri Bir*'.
- B. Of the ten books listed on the cover of *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* to highlight Piar Singh's academic accomplishments, with the exception of the controversial *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth*, none is about Sikh theology or history.
- C. Under "Print Media Bibliotheca" (printed twice), there are about 60 references for and against Piar Singh. Among Piar Singh's defenders - S. S. Dosanjh, Hracharan Bains and Darshan Singh Maini, Gurdarshan Singh Grewal and Pritam Singh, there is no one who is/was involved in Sikh Studies. Moreover, they defend Piar Singh's academic freedom, not his work. On the other hand Piar Singh's thesis is criticized by Prof. G. S. Dhillon, Prof. Balkar Singh, Prof. Prithipal Singh Kapur, Giani Gurdit Singh, Prof. Vikram Singh and Prof. Inder Singh Ghaggha, who are teachers/scholars of Sikh Studies. Besides, Piar Singh is defended by communists/Marxists (Harcharan Bains and S. S. Dosanjh), the communist

media (*Nawan Zamana*) and the Hindu media (*Jansata, Tribune, Punjabi Tribune, India Today, Indian Express, and Hindustan Times*) [15-iv].

D. According to *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy*, Pashaura Singh's thesis was criticized because his supervisor was W. H. McLeod, and Piar Singh's problems arose from the perception that "Dr. Piar Singh and Pashaura Singh both, on call from Dr. McLeod, Chairman of the Sikh Studies at a Canadian University, have challenged the authority of the Guru Granth Sahib [15-v]." In that case one would expect that Piar Singh would not do any thing that could be used as evidence of collaboration between him, McLeod and Pashaura Singh. In other words, Piar Singh would stay away as far as possible from Pashaura Singh and McLeod and not utter or write anything about them that could be construed as collaboration between the three. On the other hand in *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy*, Piar Singh is depicted as a defender of Pashaura Singh and W. H. McLeod [15-ii]. Moreover, *Gatha Sri Aadi Granth and the Controversy* was published by Jaswant Singh of Michigan, a close friend of Pashaura Singh. Pashaura Singh was a lecturer at that time at the University of Michigan. Would Piar Singh in his right mind do these things if he thought that his problems arose from the perceptions that he was collaborating with McLeod and Pashaura Singh?

These compelling arguments suggest that the ghostwriter has created an alibi by putting words in the mouth of a dead man (Piar Singh died in 1996) to defend W. H. McLeod and Pashaura Singh, and to malign Daljeet Singh (1911-1994), Jasbir Singh Mann and the Institute of Sikh Studies. Daljeet Singh is the main target as he exposed McLeod's "**scholarship, methodology and ethics.**" It is worth noting that neither McLeod nor Pashaura Singh responded to Daljeet Singh's criticism of their works when he was alive.

### Conclusion

I have presented evidence and arguments to prove that C. H. Loehlin is not the author of "The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism", and Piar Singh, in all likelihood, is not the author of *Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy*.

### REFERENCES

1. Bachittar Singh Giani (Editor); *Planned Attack on Aad Guru Granth Sahib: Academics or Blasphemy*, International Centre of Sikh Studies, Chandigarh, 1994. [1-i pp 13-14, 46-48, 302, 1-ii p 302, 1-iii pp 39-62, 1-iv pp 46-48, 1-v p 48].
2. Pashaura Singh; *The Text And Meaning Of The Adi Granth* (Ph.D. Thesis), University of Toronto, Toronto, 1991, p 92.
3. W. H. McLeod; *The Evolution of the Sikh Community in Sikhs and Sikhism*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, second ed., 1999, p 74.
4. C. Loehlin, "The Need for Textual and Historical Criticism", *The Sikh Courier*, Spring-Summer, 1987, p 18.
5. C. H. Loehlin; "Textual Criticism of the Kartarpur Granth", in *Sikh Studies: Comparative*

- Perspective on a Changing Tradition*, M. Juergensmeyer and N. G. Barrier (Editors), Graduate Theological Union, Berkley, 1979, pp 113-18.
6. Pratap Singh Giani; *Gian Amrit* (Punjabi), January 1996, p 19-20.
  7. UNESCO; *The Sacred Writings of the Sikhs*, 1960, p 24.
  8. J. S. Grewal, S. S. Bal; *Guru Gobind Singh*, Punjab University, Chandigarh, pp 188-89.
  9. Gurdev Singh (Editor); *Perspectives on the Sikh Tradition*, Siddharth Publications, Chandigarh, 1986.
  10. Daljeet Singh; *Essays on the authenticity of Kartarpuri Bir and the Integrated Logic and Unity of Sikhism*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1987.  
[10-i pp 37-8, 55-59, 72-74, 81-83].
  11. Baldev Singh; "Understanding W. H. McLeod and his work on Sikhism", SikhSpectrum.com, August, 2005; <http://www.glbalsikhstudies.net>.
  12. Baldev Singh; "My Favorite Author", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2007.
  13. Baldev Singh; "Un-academic, Unethical and Unsolicited Advice", SikhSpectrum.com, May 2007.
  14. Baldev Singh; "Sant Tradition or Sant Mat", SikhSpectrum.com, November 2007.
  15. Piar Singh; *Gatha Sri Adi Granth and the Controversy*, Anant Education and Rural Development Foundation INC, Michigan, 1996.  
[15-i p viii, 15-ii pp 55-60, 62, 160-61, 167-71, 15-iii p 60, 15-iv pp 60, 167-71, 62, 160-61, 15-v pp 55, 62].
  16. W. H. McLeod. *Discovering the Sikhs: Autobiography of Historian*, Permanent Black, Delhi: 2004.  
[16-i pp 100-04, 114-15, 151, 1169, 188, 16-ii p 101].
  17. Piar Singh; *Gatha Sri Adi Granth* (Punjabi), Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 1992.  
[17-i pp 67-8, 17-ii pp 174-203].
  18. Pashaura Singh, "Recent trends and prospects in Sikh studies", *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 1998, 27 (4), pp 407-25.
  19. Pashaura Singh, *The Guru Granth Sahib: Canon, Meaning and Authority*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2000.
  20. Gurinder Singh Mann, *The Making of Sikh Scripture*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2001.